

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ALLISON-LOUISE SHATTER,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 23-cv-10144
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

ATCHINSON FORD SALES, INC.,

Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT/COUNTER-PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT (ECF No. 108)**

In this action, *pro se* Plaintiff Allison-Louise Shatter brought claims against Defendant Atchinson Ford Sales, Inc. arising out of her purchase of a 2022 Ford Explorer from Atchinson. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.) The Court dismissed those claims by written order dated December 5, 2023. (*See* Order, ECF No. 79.)

Atchinson also filed the following counterclaims against Shatter arising out of her alleged failure to pay for the Explorer:

- Breach of Contract (Count I);
- Claim and Delivery (Count II); and
- Declaratory Judgment (Count III).

(*See* Counterclaims, ECF No. 12.) Atchinson then moved for summary judgment on those claims. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 33.)

On January 24, 2024, the Court issued an order granting Atchinson's motion for summary judgment in large part. (*See* Order, ECF No. 91.) Atchinson thereafter submitted a proposed judgment to the Court in which it asked the Court to award it specific amounts in monetary damages. However, because the record before the Court did not contain evidence supporting those amounts, the Court directed Atchinson to file a motion for entry of final judgment in which Atchinson could provide evidence supporting each of the specific amounts it claimed in damages. (*See* Order, ECF No. 105.)

On June 14, 2024, Atchinson filed a motion for entry of final judgment as the Court directed. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 108.) In that motion, Atchinson sought \$68,526.86 in total damages, and it supported that request for damages with both documentary evidence and an affidavit confirming the amounts from Atchinson's Controller, Paula Elliott. (*See id.*; *See also* Elliott Aff., ECF No. 108-7.) Atchinson also included a proposed judgment with its motion. (*See* Proposed Judgment, ECF No. 108-8.)

Shatter did not file any substantive response to Atchinson's motion or its proposed judgment. Instead, as she has frequently done in this case, she simply re-filed Atchinson's motion with the following handwritten notation on the first page: "Acceptance denied for cause – fraud upon the Court." (Resp., ECF No. 110, PageID.691.) Shatter has not specifically identified the "fraud" that she claims was

perpetrated here, nor has she raised an objection to any particular amount of Atchinson's claimed damages or to Atchinson's proposed judgment. Simply put, Shatter has not provided any argument or evidence that could call into question the amount in damages Atchinson seeks in its motion or the form or substance of its proposed judgment.

The Court has carefully reviewed Atchinson's motion, and for the reasons explained in the motion and the supporting documentation attached to the motion, the motion is **GRANTED**. The Court will enter the proposed final judgment Atchinson attached to its motion (ECF No. 108-8).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: November 4, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on November 4, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126